

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 were presented for examination and claims 1-14 were rejected. In the present amendment, claims 1, 4, 10 and 11 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for the amended claims can be found at least in the description accompanying FIGs. 1A, 1D and 3. Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-14 will be currently pending in this application, of which claims 1, 6 and 13 are independent. Applicants submit that claims 1-14 are in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

SUMMARY OF EXAMINER INTERVIEW

Applicants and his attorneys thank the Examiner for the Examiner's Interview conducted on August 27, 2008. The substance of the interview included discussing the Requirement for Information raised by the Examiner in the Office Action of June 6, 2008. In the interview, the Examiner specified the nature and form of information that he requires and the Examiner agreed to provide the Applicants with his search result that prompted his Requirement for Information. The Examiner's search result was provided via the Office Communication mailed on August 29, 2008.

Applicants submit concurrently herewith a Third Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement identifying documents complying with the Requirement for Information. Applicants also submit that the documents submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement is a full reply to the Examiner's Requirement for Information under 37 C.F.R. 1.105.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101**I. Claim 6-12 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §101**

Claim 6-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 6 is an independent claim. Claims 7-12 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of claim 6. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that subject matter recited in claims 6-12 is statutory.

Although the above mentioned claims are directed to a system, the Examiner argues that the claim limitations do not recite hardware and thus, are non-statutory. Applicants respectfully disagree. Independent claim 6 recites a ticket authority server generating a derivative session ticket for a client node and storing information about the client node and the derivative session ticket in a storage element. The subject matter of such a system claim having a ticket authority server and a storage element clearly falls within at least one of the four categories of statutory subject matter deemed patentable. The Examiner further argues that the specification describes the server as a process and thus includes a software embodiment that is non-statutory. Applicants disagree with the Examiner and contend that even in cases of software embodiments of the server, the claimed subject matter still classifies as statutory subject matter.

A software embodiment of the server comprises functional descriptive material of executable instructions (e.g., application software) which impart functionality when employed on a computing device. Such embodiments are statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to MPEP 2106.01, which states that descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." In this context, "functional descriptive material" consists of data structures and computer

programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component. When functional descriptive materials, such as software, becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to a computer readable medium, such as a computing device, the use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized and will be statutory in most cases.

In a software embodiment of the server, the server generates derivative session tickets for a client node and stores information about the client node and the derivative session ticket in a storage element. In order to perform this functionality, the functionality provided by the software of the server would be imparted because of execution on a machine, such as a computing device. Therefore, even for a software embodiment of the server, the claims maintain their status as statutory subject matter.

For at least the above-stated reasons, Applicants submit that claims 6-12 recite statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 6-12 under 35 U.S.C. §101.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

II. Claim 1-14 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claim 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by US Patent No. 6,032,260 to Sasmazel et al. ("Sasmazel"). Claims 2-5 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of claim 1, as amended. Claims 7-12 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of claim 6. Claim 14 depends on and incorporates all the patentable subject matter of claim 13. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Sasmazel fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

A. Independent Claims 1 and 6 patentable over Sasmazel

Independent claims 1 and 6 are directed towards a method and a system, respectively, for associating session tickets. These independent claims recite a ticketing authority server identifying a master session ticket associated in a storage element with the client node and generating a derivative session ticket for the client node. The ticketing authority server associates the derivative session ticket with the master session ticket. Sasmazel fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Sasmazel fails to disclose associating, by a ticketing authority server, the derivative session ticket with the master session ticket. Rather Sasmazel is directed towards user authentication using a single e-ticket. Sasmazel does not distinguish between a master session ticket and a derivative session ticket and hence does not disclose associating one with the other. Sasmazel describes only one type of e-ticket (See Sasmazel, Col. 8, lines 26-44) which is transmitted unaltered and without another ticket derived from it (See Sasmazel, Abstract). The e-ticket is not associated with any other ticket and hence Sasmazel fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 6 are patentable and in condition for allowance for at least the above mentioned reasons. Claims 2-5 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of claim 1, as amended. Claims 7-12 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of claim 6. Thus, dependent claims 2-5 and 7-12 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

B. Independent Claim 13 patentable over Sasmazel

Independent claim 13 is directed towards a method for renewing associated session tickets. These independent claims recite a ticketing authority server retrieving a session and a master session ticket associated with a received session ticket and retrieving a derivative session ticket associated with the master session ticket. The ticketing authority renews the session expiration date of the master session ticket and the expiration date if the derivative session ticket associated with the master session ticket. Sasmazel fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Sasmazel does not teach or suggest retrieving and renewing the session expiration date of the master session ticket and the expiration date if the derivative session ticket associated with the master session ticket. Rather, Sasmazel creates and updates only one type of e-ticket (See Sasmazel, Col. 8, lines 26-44). Sasmazel fails to distinguish between a master session ticket and a derivative session ticket and thus does not disclose retrieving and renewing each of the master session ticket and the derivative session ticket. Thus, Sasmazel fails to teach each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Applicants submit that independent claim 13 is patentable and in condition for allowance for at least the above mentioned reasons. Claim 14 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of claim 13. Thus, dependent claim 14 is also patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned arguments, Applicants contend that each of the Examiners' rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 8, 2008

/John D. Lanza/
John D. Lanza
Registration No. 40,060
Attorney for Applicants

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP
Two International Place
Boston, MA 02110
Phone: (617) 248-5000
Fax: (617) 502-5002
jlanza@choate.com